



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/659,781	09/11/2000	Nadarajah Asokan	017.38633X00	5149

20457 7590 02/10/2004

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
SUITE 1800
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-9889

EXAMINER

WORJLOH, JALATEE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3621

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/659,781	Applicant(s) ASOKAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Jalatee Worjloh	Art Unit 3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7, 9-11 and 14-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5, 6, 12 and 13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 18, 2003 has been entered.

2. Claims 1-24 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claims 3 and 4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 3 recites the limitation "the integrity" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 12 is objected to because of the following informalities: duplicate information; the limitation of claim 12 is already listed in claim 1, this claim does not further narrow claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

6. Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: duplicate information; the limitation of claim 13 is already listed in claim 1, this claim does not further narrow claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 3621

7. Claim 23 objected to because of the following informalities: typographically error (see line 3), change “benter” to “center”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6385729 to DiGiorgio et al. in view of US Patent No. 6516316 to Ramasubramani et al.

DiGiorgio et al. disclose accessing a gateway by the mobile station and transmitting an identification code for mobile station to the gateway; verifying the identity of the mobile station by the gateway and comparing mobile station generated variables computed by the mobile station with gateway generated variables computed by the gateway, verifying the legitimacy of the gateway by the mobile station by comparing the variables computed by the gateway with the variables computed by the mobile station (see col. 10, lines 24-60; col. 5, line 47). DiGiorgio et al. do not expressly disclose the gateway accessing an authentication center, requesting a digital certificate by the mobile station from the gateway used to order and authorize a product or service from a service provider, delivering a digital certificate to the mobile station by the gateway when the identity of the mobile station have been verified; and requesting a product or

Art Unit: 3621

service from the service provider; and transmitting a digital signature by the mobile station accompanied by the digital certificate for a signature verification key as authorization to said service provider. Ramasubramani et al. disclose the gateway accessing an authentication center (see col. 8, lines 41-48) and verifying the mobile station identity, requesting a digital certificate by the mobile station from the gateway used to order and authorize a product or service from a service provider, delivering a digital certificate to the mobile station by the gateway when the identity of the mobile station have been verified (col. 9, lines 45-54; col. 11, lines 37-41); and requesting a product or service from the service provider; and transmitting a digital signature by the mobile station accompanied by the digital certificate for a signature verification key as authorization to said service provider (see col. 4, lines 25-34). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclose by DiGiorgio et al. to include a gateway accessing an authentication center, requesting a digital certificate by the mobile station from the gateway used to order and authorize a product or service from a service provider, delivering a digital certificate to the mobile station by the gateway when the identity of the mobile station have been verified; and requesting a product or service from the service provider; and transmitting a digital signature by the mobile station accompanied by the digital certificate for a signature verification key as authorization to said service provider. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it provides security; that is, it utilizes digital certificates and signatures, which verifies the identity of the user.

Art Unit: 3621

10. Claims 2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DiGiorgio et al. and Ramasubramani et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6062472 to Cheung.

Ramasubramani et al. disclose transmitting from the mobile station to the gateway session identification and a mobile subscriber identifier and transmitting the mobile subscriber identifier from the gateway to the authentication center (see col. 7, lines 1 and 2; col. 8, lines 40-48). Ramasubramani et al. do not expressly disclose transmitting from the authentication center to the gateway a random number (RAND), a signed response (SRES), and an encryption key; computing a variable M1 by the gateway and transmitting the variable M1 and the random number to the mobile station, computing a variable M1' by the mobile station; or verifying the legitimacy of the gateway when the variable M1 equals the variable M1'. Cheung discloses transmitting from the authentication center to the gateway a random number (RAND), a signed response (SRES), and an encryption key; computing a variable M1 by the gateway and transmitting the variable M1 and the random number to the mobile station, computing a variable M1' by the mobile station; and verifying the legitimacy of the gateway when the variable M1 equals the variable M1' (see col. 3, lines 47-57, 63-67; col. 4, lines 1-11). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclose to include the steps of transmitting from the authentication center to the gateway a random number (RAND), a signed response (SRES), and an encryption key; computing a variable M1 by the gateway and transmitting the variable M1 and the random number to the mobile station, computing a variable M1' by the mobile station; and verifying the

Art Unit: 3621

legitimacy of the gateway when the variable M1 equals the variable M1'. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it provides security.

Referring to claim 7, Cheung discloses transmitting in at least one message a signed response, public key and a variable M2 computed by the gateway, computing a variable M2' by the gateway, and verifying the identity of the mobile station when the variable M2 equals the variable M2' (see col. 3, lines 47-57, 63-67; col. 4, lines 1-11).

11. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DiGiorgio et al. and Ramasubramani et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6285991 to Powar.

Powar disclose transmitting the certificate with the request for the product or service (see col. 10, lines 14-27), receiving an invoice from the service provider indicating a price for the product or service, computing a digital signature on the invoice (see col. 1, lines 7-20), approving the invoice by transmitting the digital signature to the service provider (see col. 11, lines 59-60; col. 12, lines 1-8). As for accepting delivery of a product or service by a buyer, this is an inherent step; that is, if the customer approves the invoice, he is accepting delivery of the product. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclose by DiGiorgio et al. to include the step transmitting the certificate, receiving an invoice, computing a digital signature, approving the invoice and accepting the delivery. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it confirms the requester identity thus, preventing fraud.

Referring to claim 10, Powar discloses verifying the digital signature, verifying that restrictions associated with the digital certificate are not violated (see col. 10, lines 29-61).

Art Unit: 3621

Although, Power does not explicitly disclose creating an accounting record, this is an inherent step. That is, Power discloses comparing account records; before the records can be compared it must first be created.

12. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DiGiorgio et al., Ramasubramani et al. and Power et al. as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of International Publication No. WO 99/49404 to Cochinwala et al.

Cochinwala et al. disclose transmitting from the service provider to the gateway the accounting record having an invoice and digital signature of a customer of a home network operator service, determining by the gateway that a corresponding record exists in a local database and the validity of the digital signature, determining whether the invoice violates any restrictions contained in the corresponding record, crediting the service provider with an amount equal to that in the invoice and billing the buyer with the amount of the invoice (see Abstract, lines 7-8, pg. 4, lines 19-25). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclose by DiGiorgio et al. to include the steps of disclose transmitting from the seller to the gateway the accounting record having an invoice and digital signature of a customer of a home network operator service, determining by the gateway that a corresponding record exists in a local database and the validity of the digital signature, determining whether the invoice violates any restrictions contained in the corresponding record, crediting the seller with an amount equal to that in the invoice and billing the buyer with the amount of the invoice. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because provides security.

Art Unit: 3621

13. Claims 14, 15, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramasubramani et al., Cheung in view of DiGiorgio et al.

Referring to claims 14 and 15, Ramasubramani et al. disclose a cellular network authentication module to verify that the mobile station is permitted to access a telecom infrastructure (see col. 8, lines 30-35), a mobile station certificate acquisition module to request a digital certificate for the mobile station from a gateway (see col. 9, lines 45-54), a gateway certificate generation module to verify that the mobile station is authorized to receive the digital certificate by transmitting a mobile subscriber identifier from the mobile station to an authentication center, i.e. "server module" (see col. 8, lines 40-48; col. 7, lines 1, 2; col. 5, lines 55-60), the mobile station requesting a product or service from a service provider and transmitting a digital signature accompanied by the digital certificate for signature verification key as authorization to the service provider (see col. 4, lines 25-34). Ramasubramani et al. do not expressly disclose calculate variables based on information received from the authentication center and compare them to variables computed by the mobile station and issue the digital certificate to the mobile station when the variables match, wherein the mobile station verifies the legitimacy of the gateway by comparing the variables calculated by the gateway with the variables computed by the mobile station or the mobile station certificate acquisition module verifies that the gateway is authorized to issue the digital certificate through the use of comparing variables computed by the gateway. Cheung discloses disclose a gateway certificate generation module to calculate variables based on information received from the authentication center and compare them to variable computed by the mobile station, and issue the digital certificate to the mobile station when the variables match (see col. 3, lines 47-51, 63-64; col. 4,

Art Unit: 3621

lines 1-11). DiGiorgio et al. disclose the mobile station verifies the legitimacy of the gateway by comparing the variables calculated by the gateway with the variables computed by the mobile station; wherein the mobile station certificate acquisition module verifies that the gateway is authorized to issue the digital certificate through the use of comparing variables computed by the gateway and the mobile station (see col. 10, lines 24-60). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify system disclose by Ramasubramani et al. to include calculate variables based on information received from the authentication center and compare them to variables computed by the mobile station and issue the digital certificate to the mobile station when the variables match, wherein the mobile station verifies the legitimacy of the gateway by comparing the variables calculated by the gateway with the variables computed by the mobile station. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it provides security; that is, it utilizes digital certificates which verifies the identity of the user; thus, preventing fraud.

Referring to claim 19 and 20 see the rationale above; as per the code segments, Cheung discloses software within the control means (see col. 3, lines 39-45). It is known in that art that software comprises code; thus, the examiner notes that this code may include authentication code, certificate acquisition code, certificate generation code.

14. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramasubramani et al., Cheung, and DiGiorgio et al. as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view and Cochinwala et al.

Art Unit: 3621

Ramasubramani et al. disclose a purchase module to request the purchase of a good or service from a service provider, present the digital certificate to the service provider, provide the service provider with a digital signature approving the purchase of the good or service and a sales module to verify the validity of the digital certificate and the validity of the digital signature (see col. 4, lines 24-34). Ramasubramani et al. do not explicitly teach a purchase module for receiving an invoice or a sales module for issuing an invoice; however, these are inherent steps. Ramasubramani et al. teach a purchase transaction, in which the user transmits messages and receives messages from a user web site; therefore, the examiner presumes that these messages may include invoices. Also, Ramasubramani et al. do not expressly disclose a billing module to transmit to the gateway the accounting record and receive a response indicating if the accounting record has been approved for payment, or a gateway billing module to verify the accounting record and an accompanying signature, and issue a credit to the service provider and debit to a buyer when the accounting record and the accompanying signature are verified. Cochinwala et al. disclose a seller billing module to transmit to the gateway the accounting record and receive a response indicating if the accounting record has been approved for payment, and a gateway billing module to verify the accounting record and an accompanying signature, and issue a credit to the seller and debit to the buyer when the accounting record and the accompanying signature are verified (see abstract, lines 7-8; pg. 4, lines 19-25). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclose by Ramasubramani et al. to include a purchase module that receives invoice, a sales module that issues invoice, a seller billing module to transmit to the gateway the accounting record and receive a response indicating if the accounting record has been approved for payment, and a

Art Unit: 3621

gateway billing module to verify the accounting record and an accompanying signature, and issue a credit to the seller and debit to the buyer when the accounting record and the accompanying signature are verified. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it provides security; that is, it utilizes digital certificates and signatures, which verifies the identity of the user.

Referring to claim 17, Ramasubramani et al. disclose the method wherein the gateway certificate generation module transmits a mobile subscriber identifier to authentication center (see col. 8, lines 40-48; col. 7, lines 1, 2; col. 5, lines 55-60). Ramasubramani et al. do not expressly disclose receiving a random number, a signed response and an encryption key from the authentication center, computing a variable M1, M2' and M3 and verifying the validity of the mobile station by comparing variable M2 received from the mobile station with variable M2'. Cheung discloses the gateway certificate generation module receives a random number (RAND), a signed response (SRES), and an encryption key from the authentication center; computes a variable M1, M2', and M3 and verifies the validity of the mobile station by comparing variables M2 received from the mobile station with variable (see col. 3, lines 47-57, 63-67; col. 4, lines 1-11). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclosed by Ramasubramani et al. to include the gateway certificate generation module receives a random number (RAND), a signed response (SRES), and an encryption key from the authentication center; computes a variable M1, M2', and M3 and verifies the validity of the mobile station by comparing variables M2 received from the mobile station with variable. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it provides security.

Art Unit: 3621

15. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over et al. Ramasubramani et al., Cheung and DiGiorgio et al. as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of “The GSM System” to Mouly et al.

Mouly et al. disclose a subscriber identification module (SIM) used to compute a signed response and a ciphering key based on a secret key, installed by a home network operator service in the subscriber identification module upon signing up for a service plan, and a random number obtained from an authentication center in the home network operator service; an A3 algorithm module, contained in the SIM, is used to compute the signed response; and an A8 algorithm module, contained in the SIM, is used to compute the ciphering key, wherein through the transmission of signed responses to and from the mobile station a telecommunication infrastructure is able to verify that the mobile station is authorized to access the telecommunication infrastructure and the gateway (see pg. 478-480). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclose by Ramasubramani et al. to include a subscriber identification module, A3 algorithm module, an A8 algorithm module. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to because it provides an additional level of security.

16. Claims 21 –23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramasubramani et al., Cheung in view of DiGiorgio et al. as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Cochinwala et al.

Ramasubramani et al. discloses a buyer purchase code segment to request the purchase of a good or service from a service provider, present the digital certificate to the service provider, provide the seller with a digital signature approving the purchase of the good or service and a

Art Unit: 3621

sales code segment to verify the validity of the digital certificate and the validity of the digital signature, generate an accounting record and deliver a product or service (see col. 10, lines 29-61). (see col. 4, lines 24-34, fig. 1-3). Ramasubramani et al. do not expressly disclose a purchase code segment for receiving an invoice or a sales code segment for issuing an invoice; however, these are inherent steps. Ramasubramani et al. teach a purchase transaction, in which the user transmits messages and receives messages from a user web site; therefore, the examiner presumes that these messages may include invoices. Also, Ramasubramani et al. do not expressly disclose a billing code segment to transmit to the gateway the accounting record and receive a response indicating if the accounting record has been approved for payment, or a gateway billing code segment to verify the accounting record and an accompanying signature, and issue a credit to the service provider and debit to a buyer when the accounting record and the accompanying signature are verified. Cochinwala et al. disclose a seller billing code segment to transmit to the gateway the accounting record and receive a response indicating if the accounting record has been approved for payment, and a gateway billing code segment to verify the accounting record and an accompanying signature, and issue a credit to the seller and debit to the buyer when the accounting record and the accompanying signature are verified (see abstract, lines 7-8; pg. 4, lines 19-25). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclose by Ramasubramani et al. to include a seller billing code segment to transmit to the gateway the accounting record and receive a response indicating if the accounting record has been approved for payment, and a gateway billing code segment to verify the accounting record and an accompanying signature, and issue a credit to the seller and debit to the buyer when the accounting record and the accompanying signature are

Art Unit: 3621

verified. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it provides security; that is, it utilizes digital certificates and signatures, which verifies the identity of the user.

Referring to claim 22, Ramasubramani et al. disclose the mobile station certification acquisition code segment transmits a session identification and a mobile subscriber identifier to the gate (see col. 7, lines 1 and 2; col. 8, lines 40-48). Ramasubramani et al. do not expressly disclose the station certificate acquisition code segment receives a random number and a variable M1 from the gateway and verifies that the gateway is authentic by computing and comparing the variable M1' with M1. Cheung discloses the station certificate acquisition code segment receives a random number and a variable M1 from the gateway and verifies that the gateway is authentic by computing and comparing the variable M1' with M1 (see col. 3, lines 47-57, 63-67; col. 4, lines 1-11).

Referring to claim 23, Ramasubramani et al. disclose the method wherein the gateway certificate generation code segment transmits a mobile subscriber identifier to authentication center (see col. 8, lines 40-48; col. 7, lines 1, 2; col. 5, lines 55-60). Ramasubramani et al. do not expressly disclose receiving a random number, a signed response and an encryption key from the authentication center, computing a variable M1, M2' and M3 and verifying the validity of the mobile station by comparing variable M2 received from the mobile station with variable M2'. Cheung discloses the gateway certificate generation module receives a random number (RAND), a signed response (SRES), and an encryption key from the authentication center; computes a variable M1, M2', and M3 and verifies the validity of the mobile station by comparing variables M2 received from the mobile station with variable (see col. 3, lines 47-57, 63-67; col. 4, lines 1-

Art Unit: 3621

11). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclose by Ramasubramani et al. to include the gateway certificate generation module receives a random number (RAND), a signed response (SRES), and an encryption key from the authentication center; computes a variable M1, M2', and M3 and verifies the validity of the mobile station by comparing variables M2 received form the mobile station with variable. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it provides security.

Allowable Subject Matter

17. Claims 5, 6 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- US Patent No. 6141752 to Dancs et al. discloses mechanism for facilitating secure storage and retrieval of information on a smart card by an Internet Service Provider using various network computer client devices.
- US Pub. No. 2003/0046237 to Uberti discloses a method and system for enabling the issuance of biometrically secured online credit or other online payment transactions without tokens.

Art Unit: 3621

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jalatee Worjloh whose telephone number is 703-305-0057. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Thursdays 8:30 - 7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 703-305-9768. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306 and 703-746-9443 for Non-Official/Draft.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

***Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450***

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington, V.A., Seventh floor receptionist.

January 29, 2004


**JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600**